

RECEIVED

SEP 05 2001

4 TRAVIS SOUZA: Hello, my name is Travis  
5 Souza. I'm a third-generation Nevadan, and I'm proud to  
6 say I stand with our Congressional delegation, elected  
7 officials and other concerned citizens in opposition to  
8 the Yucca Mountain project. There are a few issues I  
9 want to address.

10 First of all, Nevada is an arid climate, as  
11 we all know. Because of this, our groundwater resources  
12 are critical to the livelihood of Nevadans, urban and  
13 rural. We have already lost one of the larger aquifers  
14 under Frenchman Flats to radioactive contamination from  
15 above- and below-ground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test  
16 Site. Groundwater is also the most likely method for  
17 transportation -- transport for delivering  
18 radionuclear-type particles to the surrounding  
19 environment.

20 The Amargosa Valley, less than 30 miles from  
21 Yucca Mountain, is a growing agricultural area that  
22 provides 25 percent of Nevada's dairy products. Besides  
23 the obvious health threats to surrounding communities,  
24 the economic impact delivered by the mere implication of  
25 contamination would be disastrous for the rural economy.

0009

1 My family got their start on a small farm in  
2 Fallon. It is likely that the current leukemia cluster  
3 in that small farming town is due to groundwater  
4 contamination possibly by activities of the Department of  
5 Defense and the federal government.

6 Nevada is my home and I want to stay here.

7 Someday I'd like to buy some land out in the desert and  
8 live peacefully. My question is, will there be  
9 uncontaminated groundwater to drink or to irrigate that  
10 land?

11 As has been said, dry-cask storage on site is  
12 the safest solution that we have currently. Recently at  
13 a national convention I was speaking with some people  
14 from Minnesota, and they're a large producer of nuclear  
15 waste, but in their view they would rather keep the waste  
16 on site than allow the producers to produce more, and  
17 this is the crux of the issue. The whole plan to ship  
18 nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain is nothing more than a  
19 corporate welfare policy so that these nuclear waste  
20 producers can continue producing more waste without  
21 addressing the solution.

22 People give us a hard time because they say  
23 we're -- it's all about not in our backyard. Personally,  
24 I don't want to see high-level nuclear waste buried in  
25 anyone's backyard. Transportation is the central issue

0010

1 when considering the health and safety of Americans  
2 across the country. Over 77,000 metric tons of waste  
3 will be moved through 46 states. This will be done by  
4 truck or rail or both; we don't know.

5 If the waste is shipped solely by truck, it  
6 would require up to 104,000 trips averaging 2200 miles  
7 per trip. In addition, under the truck-only scenario,  
8 there would be 15 to 20 accidents in Las Vegas alone.  
9 Say no to mobile Chernoble. Thank you.